

Remarks:

Claims 1-20 and 27-30 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 3- 6, 14, 16, 17, 19, 27 and 28 are amended. Claims 21-26 are cancelled. And claim 30 is added. No new matter has been introduced, however, support for the amended language is provided in the specification and drawings, as filed.

**Claim Objections:**

Claim 28 is objected to due to informalities such as “The method”, “MNC” and “IMSI”. The applicant amended claim 28 as suggested by the Examiner. The objection is now moot.

**§ 112 Rejections:**

Claims 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112. The Examiner contends that there is no support for the claimed limitation, and because the claimed invention is indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter.

The applicant amended claim 16 to recite “a mobile terminal (MN) receiving a first value representing a mobile network code of a fixed length from a network”, “the MS receiving a second value which identifies whether the length of the MNC is greater than the fixed length” and “wherein if the second value is equal to a first logic level, the MS identifies the network supports the MNC having length greater than the fixed length”. Amended claim 16 clarifies that the mobile station is performing the “receiving”, and that if the second value is equal to a first logic level, the MS identifies that the network supports the MNC having length greater than the fixed length.

Amended claim 16 is supported by paragraphs [0033]-[0036], FIG. 5, paragraphs [0063] - [0069] and FIG. 6A to 6C of this specification. More specifically, the recitation of “a mobile

station (MS) receives a first value (IMSI\_10\_11) representing a mobile network code (MNC) of a fixed length (for example, 2-digits) from a network” is supported by paragraphs [0035], [0069] and FIG. 5. Further the recitation that “the MS received a second value (IMSI\_10\_INCL) which identifies whether the length of the MNC is greater than the fixed length” is supported by paragraphs [0065] - [0069] and FIG. 6A to 6C. And the recitation “wherein if the second value is equal to a first logic level, the MS identifies the network supports the MNC having length greater than the fixed length” is also supported by paragraphs [0065] - [0069] and FIG. 6A to 6C.

Amended claim 16 as supported by the specification particularly points out the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the 112 grounds of rejection are now moot.

#### **§ 102 Rejections:**

Claims 1-7, 10-15 and 21-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Chandnani et al. (US Patent 6,445,929; hereinafter “Chandnani”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

First, claims 21-26 are cancelled. So, the rejections for these claims are now moot.

Second, it is respectfully noted that anticipation of claims using a drawing requires that “the picture must show all the claimed structural features and how they are put together” and “[t]he drawings must be evaluated for what they reasonably disclose and suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art.” MPEP § 2125. Furthermore, anticipation of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 (a), (b) and (c) requires that “each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference,” that “[t]he identical

invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim" and "[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim." M.P.E.P. § 2131.

Referring to claim 1, independent claim 1 recites “transmitting a message comprising at least one of a first field and a second field, wherein the MNC has a variable length, and wherein the first field indicates whether the length of the MNC is greater than a fixed length.” Chandnani fails to disclose that the MNC has a variable length. Moreover, Chandnani does not disclose that the first field provides whether the “length of the MNC” (in contrast to the length of the entire IMSI) is greater than a fixed length.

The Examiner contends that the IMSI\_ADDR\_NUM of Chandnani corresponds to “the first field” recited in the claim 1. However, in column 5 of Chandnani, the IMSI\_ADDR\_NUM is an indicator from which the IMSI length can be calculated, but there is no teaching or suggestion about the indicator from which the MNC length can be identified. Moreover, because the length of the MNC of Chandnani is not variable, Chandnani does not provide any motivation about “the first value” which indicates whether the length of the MNC is greater than a fixed value. That is, Chandani teaches away from a variable length MNC.

For at least these reasons, Chandnani does not teach or suggest all the elements of independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 should be in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, each of the dependent claims depending on independent claim 1 should be also in condition for allowance.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope

of any claim, unless Applicants have expressly argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California, telephone number (213) 623 2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 19, 2007

By: /Lew Edward V. Macapagal/  
Lew Edward V. Macapagal, Esq.  
Registration No. 55,416  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Customer No. 035884